

REMARKS

In response to the points raised in the final Official Action dated July 1, 2003, and the Advisory Action dated October 3, 2003, applicants respectfully note that the claim format is believed to be correct and that all claims, including original claims 18-21, have been included.

In the final Official Action, the Examiner raised certain objections. Since the instant Amendment advances the same amendments to the specification and drawings which were found acceptable in the Advisory Action (along with a new revision to the specification), such objections are again believed to be fully met. Turning to the single rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, the Advisory Action initially inquires about the support for the recited (ii) before the recording layer is provided thereon. In response to this inquiry, the Examiner's attention is respectfully directed to the paragraph bridging pages 13 and 14 where it is stated that the anodic oxidation coating is preferably formed with the defined vacancy ratio. If the vacancy ratio is present when the anodic oxidation coating is formed, it is clear that it is present before the recording layer is provided thereon. As to the diameters of the micropores, the passage beginning at the bottom of page 17 of the specification describes various treatments and such are conducted before the recording layer is provided thereon. In this respect, a discussion of the recording layer is provided in the specification starting at the bottom of page 21. As to the determination of the vacancy ratio and the micropore diameters after imaging and development (the question relating to contact angle being rendered moot by the instant amendment to claim 2), with development of course requiring the presence of the recording

layer, applicants respectfully note that if these characteristics are present in the imaged plate, they are also present in the anodic oxidation coating before the recording layer is provided thereon.

As to the Examiner's comments concerning condition (i), the Examiner is correct that pages 36-37 indicate that the density of the anodic oxidation coating is determined before sealing. Accordingly, while claims are to be read in light of the specification and such understanding is apparent therefrom, applicants have amended condition (i) to make this understanding more clear without altering the scope thereof.

Since all matters are believed to be resolved, applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of the present application.

Should the Examiner wish to discuss any aspect of the present application, she is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the number provided below.

Respectfully submitted,

BURNS, DOANE, SWECKER & MATHIS, L.L.P.

By: Robert G. Mukai

Robert G. Mukai
Registration No. 28,531

P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1404
(703) 836-6620

Date: December 1, 2003

Attachments: Replacement Sheets (Figs. 1 and 2)